



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,412	12/06/2001	Scott Williams	31844.0200	6467
7590	08/12/2004		EXAMINER	
David O. Caplan Snell & Wilmer One Arizona Center 400 East Van Buren Phoenix, AZ 85004-2202			NGUYEN, VINH P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2829	

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/017,412	WILLIAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VINH P NGUYEN	2829	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-6,8-10 and 12-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,4-6,8-10 and 12-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 filed on 06/01/04 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,4-5,8,10,12-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al (pat # 6,33,625).

As to claims 1, 8 ,10 and 15-17, Lee et al disclose in figures 8-9 having a head plate/substructure (34), a plurality of rectangular beam assemblies (36a,36b) mounted to the head plate (34) and a plurality of probe needles (30b) extending through the rectangular assemblies (36a,36b) wherein each probe needle has a first end extending through one of the rectangular beam assemblies and a second end for contacting the integrated circuit and wherein each of the rectangular assemblies comprises a support beam (36a) and a probe guide (an element located directly under the beam (36a)) wherein the first end of each needle extended through the probe guide. It is noted that the probe needles (30b) have substantially equal length extending through the rectangular beam assemblies (36a,36b).

As to claim 4, it appears that the guide has a pre drilled through holes for receiving the first end of each probe needle.

As to claims 5 ,8 and 19, the probe needles are cantilever needles.

As to claim 12, it appears that the substructure (34) is a printed circuit board.

As to claim 13, it appears that the first end of the needle extends through one of the rectangular beam assemblies for contacting the sub-circuit and the second end contacts the integrated circuit.

As to claim 14, it appears that the second end of the needle forms a solderless contact with the integrated circuit.

As to claim 18, it appears that the probe guide has a drilled through hole for receiving a first end of the needle.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al (pat # 6,33,625).

As to claims 6 and 9, Lee et al disclose a probe needle assembly with many probes and does not mention about probe needle pitch of less than approximately 100microns. However, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the beam assembly of Lee et al with approximately 800-2500 probe needles so that these probe needles would make

contact with a tiny semiconductor device under test with such many test points. Furthermore, since there are many probe needles for making contact with test points on a very tiny device under test, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have the pitch of the needle would be less than 100 microns so that many probe needles would be able to contact tiny dense test points arranged on a tiny semiconductor device under test. It is noted that the number of probe needles on the beam assembly and the needle pitch would depend on the size and number of test points on the semiconductor device under test.

6. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art does not disclose the support beam comprises a steel beam

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Dass et al (Pat # 6,143,668) disclose in figure 21 probe pitch of less than 80 micron.

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VINH P. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (703) 305-4914.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.


VINH P. NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2829
08/02/04